

DOD Evaluation Committee Briefing - 27 September 1979

1. Introduction/Background

- a. Tasking and my background
- b. Early visits to SRI and AMSAA

2. Mission

3. SRI Visit: 15-17 Nov

- a. Initial orientation
- b. Work statement/training
- c. Criteria for selection of subjects

Well thought of	Adventurous
Above average intel	Open minded
Thinks well of himself	Successful
Articulate	Mature and stable
"Artistic"	

- d. Witnessed session

4. SRI Visit: 12-15 Dec

- a. Screening potential subjects
- b. Review recent SRI experiments
- c. Review of tapes
- d. Relationship of subject/interviewer
- e. Role of outbound team
- f. Factors that inhibit success
  - (1) Prior knowledge of target possibilities
  - (2) Absence of feedback
  - (3) Doing trivial tasks
  - (4) Use of repetitive target sequences
- g. Factors that enhance success
  - (1) Interest factor
  - (2) Seriousness of purpose
  - (3) Monitor/interviewer to ask questions
  - (4) Practice with feedback

5. Selection of Individuals: Target: 3 individuals

- a. Considered - 251
- b. Interviewed - 117
- c. Initial Results - 30-35 potential candidates
- d. 14 Feb - SRI visited - results
- e. Intelligence background of individuals

6. Began training late Feb - stopped March
7. Training with SRI - 13 May  
Second phase of training just started
8. Training problems
  - a. Environment
  - b. Work related situations
  - c. Availability
  - d. Frequency
  - e. Time of day
9. Target Selection Process
10. Current Program(s)
  - a. Training at SRI
  - b. "Beacon" situations
  - c. Coordinate work - 3 levels
  - d. "Real" situations
  - e. CDEC training
11. Development of TCC
12. Future Objectives:
  - a. Continue development of individual abilities
  - b. Complete training at SRI (Dec 79)
  - c. Apply RV techniques to "live problems"
  - d. Determine tasking procedures
  - e. Align resources properly
13. Evaluation Report

~~SECRET~~

①

# MISSION STATEMENT

(S/ORCON) To establish a program using psychoenergies for intelligence applications. Specifically, utilizing that field of psychoenergies referred to as REMOTE VIEWING. The program encompasses the following:

- Establishing a training program in REMOTE VIEWING utilizing selected INSCOM personnel.
- Establishing procedures for intelligence collection techniques utilizing REMOTE VIEWING.
- Establishing a mechanism for responding to intelligence collection requirements (tasking) using REMOTE VIEWING.

CLASSIFIED BY: Director, DIA  
DECLASSIFY ON: 17 Mar 99  
EXTENDED BY: Director, DIA  
REASON: 2-301-C (3) (6)

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

2

## TARGET SELECTION PROCESS

### A. TARGETS

1. Location
2. Activity
3. Time

### B. METHOD OF TARGETING

1. Beacon (Human and objects)
  - a. Initial target pool
  - b. Random (local)
  - c. Operational designate (i.e. A6E)
2. Geographic Coordinates
  - a. Target Pool
    - (1) "Fun Targets"/Initial Orientation
    - (2) Series 200 Map Targets
    - (3) TK Targets
  - b. Operational Designate
3. UTM Coordinates

### C. DEVELOPMENT OF TARGETS

1. Beacon - Initial Target Pool
  - a. 50 Targets selected by individual outside project.
  - b. Secured by another individual.
  - c. How utilized.
2. Beacon - Random
3. Operational Designate
4. Geographic Coordinates -- "Fun Targets"
  - a. Pool designed by NCOIC
  - b. Stored in Safe -- Access limited
5. Geographic Coordinates - Series 200 Map Targets
  - a. Pool designed by Project Manager
  - b. Stored in Safe - Access limited

~~SECRET~~

6. Geographic Coordinates - TK Targets
  - a. Pool designed by IIPD
  - b. Stored in SSO Area -- Access controlled by SSO.
7. Geographic Coordinates -- Operational Designate
  - a. "Customer" Request
  - b. Data stored in safe - access controlled by Project Manager.
8. UTM Coordinates
  - a. Weekly targets provided by CDEC
  - b. Data controlled by COL Moses, CDEC

# SG1A

TARGET CORRELATION CHART (TCC)\*

ASSIGNED VALUE	DESCRIPTION	RATING
1	Absolutely no target correlation.	None (0%)
2	Drawings, narrative, and feedback reaction have minimal target correlation.	Low (15%)
3	Increased target correlation, identity of target could not be determined.	Low-Moderate (30%)
4	Many target correlation factors readily recognizable. Target identity possibilities narrowed.	Moderate (50%)
5**	RV data shows unmistakable correlation to the target. Target possibilities can now be typified.	Moderate-High (70%)
6	Little or no extraneous RV data present. Target identity can be readily matched.	High (80%)
7	Correct naming of the target.	Direct Hit (100%)

\*Target Correlation Chart (TCC) was established not to prove or disprove Remote Viewing (RV), rather, it was designed to measure RV learning trends and to provide Project Management personnel a readily available management tool.

\*\*Current state-of-the-art indicates this level of expertise is the norm for an experienced Remote Viewer.


CLASSIFIED BY: Director, DIA  
DECLASSIFY ON: 31 May 99  
EXTENDED BY: Director, DIA  
REASON: 2-301-C (3) (6)

## TARGET CORRELATION CHART (TCC)

FILE NO.

1

5





TARGET CORRELATION RATINGS

<u>ASSIGNED VALUE</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1	40
2	48
3	36
4	6
5	2
6	1
7	0
Not rated	9
Not graded	<u>1</u>
TOTAL	<u>143</u>

NOTE: 60 sessions adversely influenced by noise or work related problems.